



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SN

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/371,537 08/10/99 SUDA

H 35.C13723

005514 TM02/0215
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK NY 10112

EXAMINER

VII, N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2611

DATE MAILED:

02/15/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

SN

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/371,537

Applicant(s)

SUDA ET AL.

Examiner

Ngoc K. Vu

Art Unit

2611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 November 2000.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other: _____

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments files on November 24, 2000 with respect to claims 1-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding all independent claims 1, 7, 8, 12, 13, 15, and 21 recite the limitation "wherein said ***conversion unit does not generate command data, relative to a command included in received data***, for controlling the first equipment and the second equipment". This limitation is not clear that what "command data" conversion unit does not generate, and what "a command included in received data" that conversion unit uses for controlling the first and second equipment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

3. Claims 1, 3, 7, 8, 12, 15, 17, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Okuyama et al (US 6157650).

Regarding claims 1, 7, 8, 12, 15, and 21, Okuyama et al discloses a method and apparatus for data communication between a first equipment (device/node d) that

Art Unit: 2611

performs wireless data transmission and reception (radio transmission) according to a first protocol and a second equipment (devices/nodes b and a) that performs data transmission and reception through a bus (line transmission) according to a second protocol, the apparatus and method comprising: a conversion unit/home station (device/node c) adapted to perform a format conversion between data according to the first protocol and data according to the second protocol (node c is configured to be connected with both the radio transmission system and line transmission system, and performed the communication procedure converting process). Further regarding claim 21, all devices are provided with programs or software which are necessary to make the devices execute the functions required for the transmission and receiving systems (see FIG. 1; col. 4-5, lines 37-5, col. 5-6, lines 54-9; and col. 6-7, 66-7).

Regarding claims 3 and 17, Okuyama discloses that the conversion unit converting the received data in appropriate protocol format (see col. 5-6, lines 54-9; and col. 6, lines 66-7).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okuyama et al (US 6157650).

Regarding claim 13, Okuyama discloses a data communication system comprising a wireless transmission device (device d); a home station (device c) adapted to perform transmission and reception of wireless data with the wireless transmission

Art Unit: 2611

device; and a controlled equipment (devices b and a) connected to home station through a bus and controlled according to equipment control data on the home bus, wherein the home station performs format conversion between equipment control data included in the wireless data and the equipment control data on the bus (device c performs the communication procedure converting process) (see FIG. 1; col. 4-5, lines 37-5, col. 5-6, lines 54-9; and col. 6-7, 66-7). Okuyama does not specifically disclose a wireless transmission device is a wireless telephone equipment. Official Notice is taken that it is well known in the art to transmit wirelessly data to a remote device from a cellular^{device}. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Okuyama by including a cellular transmits data wirelessly to a remote device for providing users a portable device that easy to carry and move.

Regarding claim 14, Okuyama fails to disclose the limitation of "an operation panel" from the wireless telephone equipment that adapted to change a screen. Official Notice is taken that adjusting the screen from a remote control is well known. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Okuyama by including the feature of a wireless controller makes adjustment the screen in order to let users easily adjust the screen of a remote monitor without walking to reach to the monitor.

6. Claims 4, 5, 9, 18, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okuyama et al (US 6157650) in view of Takayama (US 5991842).

Regarding claims 4 and 18, Okuyama does not specifically disclose that the conversion unit converts recording format or a compression format. However, Takayama discloses execution a coding process for compression image data in the video processing unit 2, and the video processing unit also performs the conversion of image

Art Unit: 2611

data format suitable for transmission (see col. 7, lines 16-22). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Okuyama by including compressed format for data transmission in order to optimize bandwidth.

Regarding claim 9, Okuyama does not specifically disclose each of the first and second equipment performs an image pickup function. However, Takayama discloses that an image signal picked up with the image pickup unit 1 is converted by the camera processing unit 3 into image data matching the format requested by PC (see col. 10, lines 35-45). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Okuyama by including image pickup function as a desired feature of the apparatus.

Regarding claims 5 and 19, Okuyama does not specifically disclose type of data in transmission/reception process is video, and each of the first and second equipment performs an image pickup function. However, Takayama discloses that an image signal picked up with the image pickup unit 1 is converted by the camera processing unit 3 into image data matching the format requested by PC (see col. 10, lines 35-45). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Okuyama by including image pickup function as a desired feature or design of apparatus/method.

7. Claims 2, 10, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okuyama et al (US 6157650) in view of DE 232548.

Regarding claims 2, 10, and 16, Okuyama teaches that the first equipment is radio transmission configuration such as IrDA, and second equipment is line transmission configuration such as IEEE 1394 protocol (see col. 4, lines 37-53). Okuyama fails to disclose the first equipment as being PIAFS protocol. It is noted that PIAFS is one of the standard protocols in data communications system, as described in

DE 232548 that the video signal is transmitted to PHS terminal and digital camera by PIAFS. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Okuyama by providing PIAFS protocol for transmitting video data in order to conduct efficient communication.

Further regarding claim 10, Okuyama discloses the home station (device/node c) performs the format conversion on data for each protocol (see col. 4-5, lines 61-5; col. 5-6, lines 54-9; and col. 6-7, lines 66-7).

8. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okuyama et al (US 6157650) in view of DE 232548 and further in view of Takayama (US 5991842).

Regarding claim 11, Okuyama teaches that the first equipment is radio transmission configuration such as IrDA, and second equipment is line transmission configuration such as IEEE 1394 protocol (see col. 4, lines 37-53). Okuyama fails to disclose the first equipment as being PIAFS protocol. It is noted that PIAFS is one of the standard protocols in data communications system, as described in DE 232548 that the video signal is transmitted to PHS terminal and digital camera by PIAFS. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Okuyama by providing PIAFS protocol for transmitting video data in order to conduct efficient communication.

9. Claims 6 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okuyama et al (US 6157650) in view of Matsuda et al (US 5,794,116).

Regarding claims 6 and 20, Okuyama discloses the first equipment transmitting data wirelessly to the second equipment (see col. 4, lines 37-61), but does not specifically disclose the limitation of "first equipment includes control data for controlling operation of the second equipment." However, Matsuda teaches that a wireless video

Art Unit: 2611

terminal 17 transmits a control signal to video server 11 for requesting video data through a base-station for control-data 19, and the video server 11 transmits the requested video data to wireless video terminal 17 through base-station for video-data 15 (see FIG. 1 and col. 7-8, lines 35-28). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Okuyama by including a wireless video terminal transmits a control signal to a server to control the server providing video data in order to provide controlling mechanism from device to device without the additional hindrance inherent to a wired connection in data communication system.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ngoc K. Vu whose telephone number is 703-306-5976. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Faile can be reached on 703-305-4380. The fax phone numbers for the

Application/Control Number: 09/371,537

Page 8

Art Unit: 2611

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-6306 for regular communications and 703-308-9051 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

nv
February 10, 2001


ANDREW FAILE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600